## REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-13 and 15 are currently pending. Claims 1, 11, and 15 are hereby amended. No claims are added. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 6, 8-11, 13 and 15 are independent. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the Interview on October 16 ,2007, in which the claims were discussed. In that interview, the Examiner agreed that the claims had not been fully examined, in that the limitation "parsing only the non-matching content of the received data file" from claim 1 and similar limitations in other claims were not addressed in the Final Office Action.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing a "syntax tree." Applicant respectfully disagrees. A portion of an abstract syntax tree is shown in at least FIG. 3, and designated with the label 300, which is described in the specification as an AST (Abstract Syntax Tree).

The Examiner further objected to the drawings as not showing a "token master" as recited in claim 11. Applicant hereby amends the claim 11, mooting the Examiner's rejection.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 11 and 15 were objected to as indefinite through the use of the phrase "parsing input data" in the preamble. Applicant hereby amends the claims to remove the phrase "parsing input data" in the preamble, thereby mooting the objection.

Rejection of Claims 1, 4-6, 8-13 and 15

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 8-12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Agrawal et al. (United States Publication No. 2002/0004813, hereafter "Agrawal"), in view of Melbin (United States Publication No. 2003/0018612, hereafter "Melbin") and further in view of Hirose et al. (United States Publication 2005/0246635).

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Agrawal, nor Melbin, nor Hirose teach or suggest parsing only the non-matching content of a received data file or web page as substantially required by claims 1, 4-6, 8-12 and 15. As described above, in the Final Office Action, the Examiner did not address the limitation "parsing only the non-matching content of the received data file" from claim 1, or any of the similar limitations in the other pending claims. Applicants further submit that none of the cited references teach or suggest parsing only the non-matching content of a received data file. Therefore, Applicant submits that the rejection is improper.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Please charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayments, to our Deposit Account No. 03-1721.

Respectfully submitted,
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP


 /John D. Lanza/
John D. Lanza
Registration No. 40,060

Patent Group
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Tel: (617) 248-5000
Fax: (617) 248-4000
Date: May 22, 2008

4322541v1